

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

**Pacific Electric ROW/West Santa Ana Branch Corridor
Alternatives Analysis**

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #7

Tuesday, April 19, 2011

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

City of Buena Park
Walter D. Ehlers Community Center – Heritage Hall
8150 Knott Avenue
Buena Park, CA 90620

Meeting Notes

Invitees	Organization
Philip Law	SCAG
Matt Gleason	SCAG
Stephen Fox	SCAG
Mary Nguyen	FTA
Wendy Garcia	OCTA
Marissa Espino	OCTA
Alan Patashnick	Metro
Michael Kodama	OLDA
John Walker	Los Angeles County DPW
Howard Huie	California Public Utilities Commission
Lupe Valdez	Union Pacific
David Sanchez	City of Anaheim
Deborah Chankin	City of Bellflower
Hal Arbogast	City of Cerritos
Kamran Dadbeh	City of Cypress
Keith Jones	City of Garden Grove
Bill Pagett	City of Lakewood/City of Maywood
Jimmy Ewenike	City of Los Angeles, LADOT
G. Daniel Ojeda	City of Lynwood
Christopher Cash	City of Paramount
Dave Biondolillo	City of Santa Ana
Kevin Wilson	City of Vernon
Katherine Padilla	Katherine Padilla & Associates
Nancy Michali	AECOM
Yara Jasso	AECOM
Joel Ulloa	AECOM

1. Welcome

- P. Law initiated the meeting with introductions and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Initial Set of Alternatives, review the technical information presented at past Technical Advisory Committee meetings, and to identify a Final Set of Alternatives for recommendation to the Steering Committee.

2. Initial Screening Criteria

- N. Michali reviewed the information that provided the framework for the Initial Screening efforts and will form the basis for the recommendation of the Final Set of Alternatives: the Corridor Purpose and Need and related Mobility Problem, and the study goals and criteria identified with stakeholders and the community.

3. Initial Screening Phase

- N. Michali presented the Initial Screening results for each of the alternatives including ridership, mobility improvements, and community support.

4. Final Screening Phase

- W. Garcia (OCTA): Can you give a brief explanation as to what the next steps are, and what level of analyses will be undertaken for the alternatives that are moving forward?
 - N. Michali: The Final Screening phase begins to look at a three to five percent level of engineering work, including defining the horizontal alignment and vertical configuration, i.e., what will be above-grade versus at-grade. We will also look at capital and operating costs and ridership. Metro has shared their model with the Project Team, and we have validated it for the Corridor Study Area. Therefore, we will be able to develop ridership information identifying who the project will be serving better, where they will be coming from and traveling to, and who are new transit riders. We will also develop a conceptual level environmental assessment of the alternatives. We will also be working with you on developing final station locations through detailed working sessions, especially with the cities of Vernon, South Gate, Huntington Park, and Los Angeles who are the keys to making decisions in the Northern Connections Area.
 - W. Garcia: How about routing the BRT Alternative alignment around the cities of La Palma and Cypress? Will you be identifying that as well?
 - N. Michali: Yes. What we have done with Metro, is they have shared with us their suggested routing for the BRT Alternative and connecting services. We would like to work with OCTA and listen to what you would prefer for the BRT alignment.
 - M. Kodama (OLDA): This information has been very helpful to us. Is there anything else you think we should do today in preparation for next week's Steering Committee meeting?
 - N. Michali: We would appreciate input on whether you think this presentation works well for the Steering Committee.
 - W. Garcia: I would suggest you explain in more detail why the alternatives that are not moving forward were not recommended for further study. It is important to clearly explain that the recommendations were determined based on technical analyses.
-

- N. Michali: We will include that.
- A. Patashnick (Metro): Are there plans outside the working sessions with the cities to do any additional public outreach?
 - N. Michali: We thought the summer would be a great time for us to do our engineering and design work, and we proposed to come back on July 19th to have a TAC working session to update you on our progress. Also, during Project Initiation, we prepared a capital and operating costs technical memorandum that Metro, OCTA, and Caltrans provided initial input on. We would appreciate having more agency input and then concurrence on the cost methodology before moving further into detailed analyses. If the Low Speed Maglev Alternative is recommended to move forward, we would have a working session for everyone to agree on the parameters for that alternative.
- K. Wilson (Vernon): Will you be meeting with cities to discuss vertical alignments?
 - N. Michali: Yes, we would like to meet with individual cities. However, in our previous meetings we found that when we include two to three cities that they can interact and inform each other of different opportunities. We will definitely be spending a lot of time with the City of Vernon.
- M. Kodama: Will you be presenting this Low Speed Maglev Alternative information to the Steering Committee? I would recommend addressing that there are a few types of maglev services operating, and that this is a Low Speed Maglev.
 - N. Michali: We will clarify that point. The reason we are focusing on the Nagoya Low Speed Maglev service is that this city also operates BRT, Subway, and LRT allowing us to make cost and ridership comparisons that can be transferred to Southern California.
- W. Garcia: Is this the only Low Speed Maglev system in revenue service?
 - N. Michali: Yes.

5. Identify Recommended Final Set of Alternatives

- N. Michali reviewed the Initial Set of Alternatives as well as technical information for each alternative including ridership, mobility improvements, and community support. She noted that the Project Team recommended removing the DMU Alternative and both High Speed Service Alternatives from further consideration, while moving forward with the BRT, Street Car, and LRT options, and with Steering Committee direction, the Low Speed Maglev Alternative.
 - B. Pagett (Lakewood/Maywood): Can we bring our recommendation down to one alternative – the Low Speed Maglev?
 - P. Law: You can make a recommendation if you all agree on that.
 - W. Garcia: The Steering Committee will decide the direction of the Low Speed Maglev Alternative; we cannot decide that at this time. OCTA supports the three alternatives that have been recommended for further study, and there is technical merit for not having recommended the three options that were removed.
 - A. Patashnick: I will second that motion.
 - P. Law informed the TAC that these recommendations will be moved forward to the Steering Committee and will seek direction from them on the Low Speed Maglev Alternative.
 - A. Patashnick: So there could potentially be six alternatives, including the No Build, TSM, Street Car, BRT, LRT, and Low Speed Maglev?
-

- P. Law: Yes. The main question with moving the Low Speed Maglev alternative forward would be the requirement of additional funds from SCAG and impacts to the project budget to move forward. That information will be provided to the Steering Committee before they make their recommendation.
- P. Law announced that OCTA selected Mayor Carolyn Cavecche, from the City of Orange, as the Orange County Co-Chair of the Steering Committee.

6. Next Meeting

Purpose: Provide update on Final Screening and Station Area Planning Efforts

- Tuesday, July 19, 2011, 1:30 PM
- Location: TBD

7. Upcoming Schedule of Study Efforts

- | | |
|---|----------|
| ▪ Hold Steering Committee Meeting | April 27 |
| ▪ Concurrence on Final Set of Alternatives | April 27 |
| ▪ Initiate Final Screening Efforts | May 2 |
| ▪ Hold Technical Advisory Committee Meeting | July 19 |